

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-45 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 17, 20, 36, and 44 are independent.

Claim 45 has been added and claims 1, 17, 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document. Acknowledgment thereof by the Examiner in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference(s) supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed April 13, 2006, November 27, 2007, August 5, 2008, and January 27, 2009, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the telephone interview which was conducted on May 4, 2010.

During the interview, the Examiner expressed the following points:

The Examiner believes that it is not clear whether the invention applies to a case where a media file is broken up into pieces and recombined into a combination of sub-pieces; or whether the invention pertains to receiving pieces of content from various sources.

The Examiner believes that claims do not indicate how collective partial content are produced.

Proposed claim amendments were discussed during the interview. Applicants have amended the claims by taking into consideration discussion during the interview.

Applicants note that the present invention applies to either case expressed by the Examiner of a file broken up into pieces, or content from multiple sources. Applicants submit that in either case, the input-output interface inputs a plurality of contents. Thus, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the providing source provides to the input-output interface a plurality of partial contents.

Applicants have removed the function of the “source” in order to clarify the perspective of the input-output interface.

Based on the disclosure in the present specification, Applicants added the licensing generation unit “for integrating said plurality of partial contents into a collective content.” This amendment is intended to address the Examiner’s concern with regard to how collective partial content is provided.

Applicants have added a physical feature of “each partial content including a unique use condition field storing a use condition as license information,” to replace “a partial content that holds license information containing a unique use condition.” This amendment is intended to address the Examiner’s concern with “hold” and “license information.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13, 15, 17-32, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication 2004/0143760 (Alkove). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 17, and 20 have been amended to explicitly recite that the license generating unit integrates the plurality of partial contents into the collective content, as well as generation of the single license. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in

independent claims 1, 17, and 20 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to content use control in a user device while Alkove relates to content licensing for distribution to a user device. In particular, the present invention is related to a content use device that performs use control of content which the user's device receives from an external source(s). The present invention enables a user to, for example, edit broadcasted streams, by assigning licensing information to respective components of streams and generating a single license information. Use conditions in the license information are enforced for components of streams in the group.

In contrast, in the case of Digital Rights Management (DRM) such as disclosed in Alkove, a user's device is restricted by licensing a group of one or more data streams making up an encoded data file 112.

In an example embodiment of the present invention, contents are streams of BS/CS/terrestrial digital broadcastings, and partial content can be obtained based on time, PID (e.g., of a elementary stream), or component group (e.g., group of elementary streams). Licensing information is generated from control information contained in a stream when recording the content from the digital broadcasting. Each partial content is assigned licensing information, then controlled based on the generated licensing information.

Alkove discloses services for a content owner via a content packager 104. Using the content packager 104, a content owner can define particular business rules that correspond to specified groups of the data stream content from an encoded file 112 (Fig. 4, steps 404, 406). Data stream content is grouped by encrypting the encoded media file 112 with a header 202 that indicates the grouped data streams, to generate data file 114. The content packager specifies business rules 116 to license the grouped data streams. Subsequently, the end user access is conventionally controlled according to the one or more business rules or licensing terms that are associated with the specified group of data stream content (Fig. 4, step 414).

In Alkove, the end user is not provided with a facility to combine data files or edit data streams in a manner that preserves the respective business rules or license terms corresponding to the original data files.

On the other hand, the present invention maintains use control of various content while giving the end user flexibility in editing content as partial content. Maintenance of use control is facilitated by a mechanism that generates a single license for the collective content.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, and 20 in order to clarify differences between the claimed invention and the licensing system in Alkove.

With regard to dependent claims, Applicants submit that claims that depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 17, and 20 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore the dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1, 17, and 20.

Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 16, 33, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alkove in view of U.S. Application Publication 2002/0056747 (Matsuyama). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

With regard to dependent claims 14, 16, 33, and 35, Applicants submit that claims 14, 16, 33, and 35 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 20 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 14, 16, 33, and 35 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1 and 20. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

New Claim

As disclosed in the present specification, a solution provided by the present invention is “when editing content to make new content, to assign to parts constituting the new content the original use conditions.” Claim 45 has been added as a dependent claim to emphasize this aspect of the disclosed invention. Applicants submit that at least for the reasons above for claim 1, claim 45 is patentable as well.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs**, Registration No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Downs*
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000